

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-12, and 19 are pending. Claims 13-18 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Applicant maintains his traversal of the Restriction Requirement set forth in the Reply to Election/Restriction Requirement filed November 6, 2008. By this Amendment, the title, the Abstract, the specification, claims 1, and 3-12 are amended, claims 13-18 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claim 19 is added. No new matter is added. Claims 13-18 have been canceled to be pursued in a Continuation/Divisional application. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 2-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. The allowable features of claim 2 have been added to independent claim 1, claim 2 has been canceled, and the dependency of claims 3-6 has been connected. Accordingly, independent claim 1 should be in condition for allowance, along with claims 3-6 and 12, which depend therefrom. Further, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claim 7 should be in condition for allowance along with claims 8-11 and 19, which depend therefrom.

The Office Action objected to the claim listing. The claim listing has been amended to address the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

Serial No. **10/572,955**

Docket No. **P-0770**

Amdt. dated April 14, 2009

Reply to Office Action of January 15, 2009

The Office Action objected to the specification for informalities. The Examiner's comments have been addressed in amending the specification. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the title as allegedly being not descriptive. By this amendment, the title has been amended to be more descriptive. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the Abstract. The Examiner's comments have been addressed in amending the Abstract. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Seo, U.S. Patent No. 6,089,836, or Oh et al. (hereinafter "Oh"), U.S. Patent No. 6,202,791, and rejected claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Heo et al. (hereinafter "Heo"), U.S. Patent No. 6,881,042. These rejections are moot in view of the amendments discussed above.

Serial No. **10/572,955**

Docket No. **P-0770**

Amdt. dated April 14, 2009

Reply to Office Action of January 15, 2009

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck, Esq.
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 CLD:gs/pb

Date: April 14, 2009

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-937\186654.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610